



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,069	03/30/2001	Katsuyuki Suzuki	205279US-3X	5315

22850 7590 08/11/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PIERCE, WILLIAM M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3711

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,069

Applicant(s)

SUZUKI ET AL.

Examiner

William M. Pierce

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-12 and 14-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-12 and 14-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM M. PIERCE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3711

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claims 1,3-8,10-12 and 14-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended claims now call for the core diameter to be "a diameter of solid core material extending out to said one or more chip discharging grooves." Such a definition does not appear to be supported by the specification. Applicant's definition and meaning of core diameter appears to be on at [0042] of the specification where it is defined as element 14 of fig. 3. Nowhere in the specification was found a discussion of a "solid core material".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1,3-8,10-12 and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tool and Manufacturing Engineers Handbook in view of Mori and Normura as set forth in the previous office action and below in response to applicant's remarks.

At [0042] of the specification, applicant defines his core diameter to be "in the middle of the land portions". This is equivalent to the "web" as shown by the Handbook. Note on pg. 9-15, the web is defined as "the central portion of the body that joins the lands. Note fig. 9-26 that shows web thickness. On pg. 9-43 Handbook states with respect to web thickness that, "because the chisel edges are noncutting portions of drill point, the webs of twist drills are made as thin as possible, consistent with adequate structural strength. The approximate web thicknesses near the points of standard drills, expressed as a percentage of the drill diameters, are presented in Table 9-9. Heavy-duty drills have thicker webs (about twice the thickness of standard general-purpose drills) and often have narrower flutes to increase torsional stiffness". Exactly as stated by applicant at [0042], "when the core diameter is smaller...the flexural rigidity of the main body 2 will be reduced." Table 9-30 of Handbook shows the web thickness relationship to the chisel edge length. In the second paragraph of this page it discusses "changes in web thickness" of fig. 9-31.

Applicant's remarks on his pg. 12, believe that "since there is no fixed proportion taught or suggested between chisel edge length and web thickness" his claimed range is not suggested. The examiner cannot agree. An artisan is not compelled to blindly follow the teaching of one prior art reference over another without the exercise of independent judgement. *Lear Siegler, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 733 F.2d 881, 889, 221 USPQ 1025, 1032 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Further, the prior art does not have to teach the exact range. When the prior art discloses a range which

Art Unit: 3711

touches, overlaps or is within the claimed range, but no specific examples falling within the claimed range are disclosed, a case by case determination must be made as to anticipation. In order to anticipate the claims, the claimed subject matter must be disclosed in the reference with "sufficient specificity to constitute an anticipation under the statute." What constitutes a "sufficient specificity" is fact dependent. These facts are set forth above in the examiner's interpretation of the Handbook reference. Examiner has considered whether there is evidence of unexpected results and has determined that none are of record. The core diameter and its effects on the rigidity and durability of a drill are discussed in the applied art as set forth above.

### **Conclusion**

This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication and its merits should be directed to William Pierce at E-mail address [bill.pierce@USPTO.gov](mailto:bill.pierce@USPTO.gov) or at telephone number (571) 272-4414.

For **official fax** communications to be officially entered in the application the fax number is (703) 872-9306.

For **informal fax** communications the fax number is (703) 308-7769.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the **status** of this application or proceeding can also be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Any inquiry concerning the **drawings** should be directed to the Drafting Division whose telephone number is (703) 305-8335.

  
**WILLIAM M. PIERCE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**